DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 324 SP 037 149

AUTHOR Ledic, Jasminka
TITLE Philanthropy in Croatia: The Problems of Teaching.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (New York, NY, November 7-9, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Evaluation; *Curriculum Development; Education Courses; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Philanthropic Foundations; Preservice Teacher Education; *Private Financial Support; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Croatia; Philanthropists

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the experience of a professor at the University of Rijeka (Croatia) teaching "Philanthropy and Education," a course offered for seniors in education in the 1995-96 academic year. The idea and support for teaching philanthropy in Croatia were developed and enabled through the project "Initiating Philanthropic Activities in Croatia through Teacher Education," supported by the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy and designed to promote the values of philanthropy, primarily through teacher education. The course content includes three sections: philanthropic tradition, the Third Sector, and philanthropy and education. In each area, an attempt is made to use examples from Croatian tradition and culture and to explore these problems in the context of the present political and social transitions. Since philanthropy is not recognized as a field of study in Croatia, there is a lack of faculty support for the course. There are also difficulties in making materials and information available in the Croatian language so class resources are in a foreign language. In the future, it will be necessary to develop local materials and texts. It is proposed that the course be offered to student teachers, especially those in K-12, to provide a foundation for philanthropic values from the very beginning of schooling. Contains over 100 references, a list of journals and other publications, the course syllabus, and student course evaluations. (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 324

PHILANTHROPY IN CROATIA: THE PROBLEMS OF TEACHING

Paper presented at The ARNOVA Silver Anniversary Conference,
November 7-9, 1996, New York City
(Session D4: Teaching Nonprofit Managers, presented under the title:
"TEACHING PHILANTHROPY IN CROATIA"
November 7, 4.00-5.45 p.m.)

Jasminka Ledic
University of Rijeka
School of Education
Omladinska 14
HR-51000 Rijeka
CROATIA-EUROPE

tel. ++385 51 809 515
fax ++385 51 515 142
e-mail: jledic@mapef.pefri.hr

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Ledic

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP037419

Teaching Philanthropy in Croatia
(abstract)

Jasminka Ledic
University of Rijeka
School of Education

This paper presents the experience in teaching "Philanthropy and Education", course offered for seniors in Educational sciences at the University of Rijeka (Croatia) School of Education in the 1995/96 academic year. This is unique course on this topic at Croatian universities, and probably at the whole area of Eastern and Central Europe.

The course was offered as part of the project "Initiating Philanthropic Activities in Croatia (Rijeka) Through Teacher's Education", funded by Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Twenty-two seniors enrolled the course. The content of the course included three sections: philanthropic tradition, the third sector, and philanthropy and education, which dealt mainly with the problems of values, moral education and promoting prosocial behavior. In every topic, an attempt was made to find out examples from Croatian tradition and culture, and to explore the problems in the context of our present "transitional" situation.

Although some of them were quite common for West European and American universities, course included a lot of innovations that were highly valued in student's course evaluations: 1. new and unique content (philanthropy, third sector, teaching values) was promoted; 2. "Philanthropic Collection" was established at the School's library, which enabled access to recent publications; 3. student-oriented methods were used (group discussions, panels and independent study was emphasized, with only a few lectures); 4. final exam was avoided, because students were expected to do a lot of work during the terms; 5. course evaluation was done continuously. Generally, student's evaluation showed that this was one of the best courses they enrolled, particularly concerning the quality of content, teaching methods and applicability to their future practice. They stated that the innovations described should be kept and developed.

Although having a big success, I was faced with a lot of difficulties doing this pioneer work. Philanthropy as a field of study is not at all recognized in my country, what was the main cause of the majority of my problems; first, there's a problem of accepting this work form the colleague's side; then, the problem of the proper Croatian terminology in philanthropy and third sector which does not exist. Students were directed almost exclusively to foreign languages literature, mainly English, what was difficult for the majority of them.

What has to be done to promote teaching of philanthropy is to include colleagues from various disciplines to study and teach philanthropy. In addition, some basic texts should be translated, and papers promoting the values of philanthropy published in Croatian journals. Finally, the course should be offered to student teachers, especially K-12, to provide the possibility to get in touch with philanthropic values from the very beginning of schooling.

Teaching philanthropy in Croatia[1]

Introduction

In this paper I am going to present my experience in teaching "Philanthropy and Education", course offered for seniors in Educational Sciences at the University of Rijeka (Croatia) School of Education in the 1995/96 academic year. This is unique course on this topic at Croatian universities, and - as far as my knowledge is concerned - in the whole area of Eastern and Central Europe. I intend to present it in a form of case study including the information needed for a reader to understand the circumstances, problems, and solutions which I have accepted during my work. Since this paper is primarily written for American/international audience, due to differences in higher education system, cultures, habits, etc., I will have to present some of the facts which go beyond this single course. Specific aspects of teaching (philanthropy) at higher education level which could be quite normal for an American university professor, became quite new when used in Croatian circumstances. It is my idea that this paper should at the first place show the difficulties I was facing while presenting a new and very specific field to the situation which is not quite common (at least for American and West European understanding), and to open my experience to the people in my region who are willing to begin similar enterprise. I believe that at least some parts of my experience could be transferred to the similar environment which we could find in Central and Eastern Europe.

I have chosen to present my work in form of a qualitative case study (Merriam, 1988), because the aim of my work is not to control and manipulate variables, but to describe, examine and interpret what and how was happening. The focus of my investigation was a bounded phenomenon: *university course given for the first time in a new-born country going through thorough political, social and economic changes*, causing rapid and substantial changes of values. Qualitative case study design was chosen for this paper because the situation I am going to present is *particularistic* - it describes a particular event, never to happen again. I am going to *describe* the happening in a *heuristic* manner, attempting to clarify understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. And, finally, the conclusions I intend to develop will be generated *inductively*.

Last, but not least, the effects of my work could have been assessed only partly at this point. I will probably never be able to find out the real outcomes of my teaching; that is, how many of my students and in what extent will they become involved in philanthropic activities and become aware of their role as citizens. And, what is even more important for their mission as future educators: in what extent are they going to spread this ideas among their students? This fact too led my interest in this paper from product to process.

---

[1] The idea and support for teaching philanthropy in Croatia was developed and enabled through the project "Initiating Philanthropic Activities in Croatia (Rijeka) Through Teacher's Education", funded by Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. This project is part of the program "Eastern European Initiative". I would like to thank professor Robert Payton and Dr. Miroslav Ruzica, who attracted me to the field and made possible my work on the project.

Background

The course "Philanthropy and Education" was developed and offered to the students as part of the project "Initiating Philanthropic Activities in Croatia (Rijeka) Through Teacher's Education", funded by Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. This project is part of the program "Eastern European Initiative".[1] I was invited to join "Eastern European Initiative", with the task to promote philanthropic idea (primarily) by developing curriculum for teaching philanthropy to the future educators.

To get the basic impression of the circumstances I was facing, it is necessary to explain at least a few details concerning higher education in Croatia, pointing out primarily at the differences in higher education system in Croatia. What was concerning the commencement of my work greatly, was the fact that students have very few possibilities to create their own course of studying. The university in Croatia is usually divided in different schools, and schools into departments. The School of Education, where I work, has several departments (Department of Education, Department of Psychology, Department of Philology, etc.). Within the schools students chose their programs, b.e., educational sciences, psychology, etc., with rather close course of study and with very few possibilities for electing courses. Required courses consist almost entire program, and the percentage of elective courses is very low (maximum about 10-15 percent, depending on program). There is, unfortunately, no possibility for student from one school to enroll the course from another one, and this counts even for the different programs within the same school. This situation, of course, narrows the possibility for students to enroll different (elective) courses.

In spite of my awareness of such a situation, within my project I still intended not only to develop curriculum for teaching philanthropy, but to try to offer the course even when the possibilities for the course to be accepted were rather weak.

Since I returned to my home country at the beginning of March 1995, I planned to make all the necessary preparations for the academic year 1996/97., that is, to prepare the curriculum and to make all administrative work connected with the possible acceptance of the course in the study program for the students in Educational sciences within academic 1995/96. year. Since I was highly motivated for the development of the course, I did all the necessary administrative work within the next few months (March-May 1995).

Fortunately for my project, a rather unexpected situation happened in June 1995: for the 1995/96. academic year neither one professor from the Department of Education offered elective course, and I suddenly got the chance to "jump" with my course a year before I was planning to. The course I intended to offer for 1996/97. had all chances to be accepted in 1995/96. academic year (a year before I planned). In spite of the fact that I was not prepared to start the course so early, I felt that I have to accept this chance. So, in July of 1995, my course "Philanthropy and Education" was scheduled for seniors in Educational Sciences to start in Fall 1995. Last but not least, as the only course offered for seniors, it became required, not elective.

Preparation for the course

Although initiating philanthropic activities through teacher's education was stated as goal of my project, I felt that - besides stressing the (philanthropic) content which is useful for education, my course should include at least basic information on third sector and civil society. Living in Croatia, one can feel that we are in dire need for any kind of civic education. So, the content of the course I was preparing was to include three sections: *philanthropic tradition, the third sector, and philanthropy and education*, which dealt mainly with the problems of values, moral education and prosocial behavior promotion. In every topic, an attempt was made to find out examples from Croatian tradition and culture, and to explore the problems in the context of our present "transitional" situation.

Besides entirely new content which I was to present to my students, I planned to renew methods of teaching and learning. Here I have to point out my dissatisfaction with the student assessment procedures which are regularly used at Croatian universities. Usually, students are not obliged to regularly attend classes. Class meetings are mainly structured very traditionally, divided into lectures and seminars. Student oriented methods which promote active learning are not widely used, and deep level learning is promoted only exceptionally. Student's assessment regularly happens exclusively at the final exams, which are not very thorough, and rarely, in my opinion, professor is able to assess entire student's work objectively and successfully. In addition to the outside factors (few possibilities to get employment in their profession, low socio-economic status for people in the field of education, overall crisis due to war, economic divisions, etc.), many factors within the university itself result in weak motivation for studying, and low standards of acquired knowledge, which is at least partly connected with old equipment and poor libraries.

Besides presenting entirely new content, my idea was to try to improve the level of motivation for studying the course, to give the students the best possible information and sources for their work, and to improve the assessment system primarily by using active methods of teaching and studying and to change substantially the assessment procedures.

Although I was familiar with the new literature in the field, I faced serious problems when I had to think about readings for my students. I searched Croatian National Library in order to find sources for studying, by using key-words and UDK numbers to search for the topics concerning philanthropy and third sector. My search resulted with only four (?)items, not very usable for my purpose. I knew that the problem connected with new books and journals at our universities is very serious, that is, professors and students due to lack of funding are out of information about new developments in their fields, so within the project I planned to equip the library with the necessary literature, considering this as additional factor for the students to be interested in this course. At that point I started to receive the books which I have been previously ordered, and I was positive that by the beginning of the academic year I will have a small collection of books which would be sufficient for the commencement of the course. But, the main problem was students' level of understanding English language, and their willingness to put special efforts in it. Regretfully, our students are rarely required to use foreign language literature, and stating the requirement to use almost exclusively English literature could result with problems

in our relations, what I certainly wanted to avoid. This was the reason I decided to translate a few fundamental (required) texts and use English language literature for additional literature.

The Course it the academic 1995/96. year

Twenty-two seniors in educational sciences[2] enrolled the course. We were supposed to meet every week for 3 hours[3]. At the beginning of the academic year I found them not very stimulated for the course work. They felt they are facing the last year of their university life, with minor possibilities for employment. Most of them were convinced that they will have to accept jobs which require lower levels of education that they will have after graduation. In addition, they were not satisfied with the content, methods, and approaches to teaching and learning they had during their university work.

To conclude, it was not a desirable situation to start, but I tried to use this "crisis" in a positive way. I introduced quite new content and methods. I presented extended course syllabi and tried to get an agreement about methods of evaluation. We agreed not to have final exam, but to do all the coursework during the academic year. This was motivating for them, because they were required to take a lot of courses as seniors[4], and had the idea they will benefit from the avoidance of final exam.

Contrary to the most of the everyday practice at Croatian universities, students of "Philanthropy and Education" were always informed about their duties for the next class. Since this was quite new practice for them, I tried to be very explicit and for every class I prepared a short list of tasks they had to do for the next class. According to my approximations, they had to work from 2 to 3 hours every week to fulfill the task.

I have already mentioned that I divided my course into three units: philanthropic tradition, the third sector and philanthropy and education (Appendix 1: Philanthropy and Education (extended) course syllabi). My idea was that I should try to relate on domestic experience, traditions and values in order to root this idea in somewhere existing, but maybe forgotten experience. Besides, I wanted them to become aware of the contemporary situation; that is, to connect my course work with everyday experience and happenings (in their communities, neighborhoods, on TV, in newspaper). On the other hand, I decided to include much of the international experience, in order to show the contemporary situation in the third sector development. Last but not least, I should have always kept in mind that these were the students in the field of education, and my course was to be adapted to their profession.

The first and the second part of the course were, in fact, dedicated to get the main ideas on *philanthropy and third sector*. They went through two basic texts (Appendix 2: List of (basic) translated texts (articles and chapters of the books) used in the course), but I had to present a lot of examples in order to clear the things. This was especially important for studying third sector (the idea of three sectors was entirely new for my students). Here I found the opportunity to present the concept of civil society in a broad sense, as well as Croatian third sector situation. We examined and criticized legal solutions concerning third sector. We went through role-playing of

the process of founding a nonprofit association and prepared a project to be founded by a foundation. Through mini-lectures I was trying to present to the students different opinions, ideas, contradictions and oppositions.

The third part of the course was closer to their profession and here I tried to make closer contacts with philanthropy and education in a broader sense. The texts I have been using were rather simple and were pointing to the examples of philanthropic behavior for the children and from them. The other section of texts dealt mainly with the philosophical and psychological aspects of (philanthropic) behavior. This section of the texts discussed main approaches to moral education (from the philosophic and educational point of view), as well as approaches designed to promote prosocial behavior. This part of the course was very successful, because students felt they could use those ideas in their day-to day practice. Besides, this content was not covered in the courses they had during their previous course work. Another aspect which positively influenced their motivation was the fact that students did not feel this course as financial burden.[5]

Our work during the course went rather smoothly. I felt that their motivation was rising and falling slightly, connected mostly with the topic they were more interested in, or amount of assignments they had to do for this and other courses. Almost every basic aspect of the course was entirely new for all of us: the content, methods and assessment procedures.

I felt that I was not able to completely fulfill all the expectations *I myself* had put in front of me. Because the course came a whole academic year too early, I had to make thorough weekly preparations *in continuo*, not well in advance like I was planning to. I had to work a lot on using different teaching methods (which meant much more work to be done when compared to the traditional lectures delivering). But, the most difficult and time consuming was the fact that I gave up from the final exam, which resulted in big amount of weekly assessment work, done out-of-classes (grading their reaction papers, written assignments, etc.) Since this course was not my only teaching obligation, but about ¼ of teaching load, I was dig up in the work for the whole academic year, feeling that I am not able to give the best quality of my work in every moment.

Conclusions: what was achieved

Although some of the achievements I am going to mention are quite common for West European and American universities, course "Philanthropy and Education" included a lot of innovations that were quite new for Croatian circumstances, and were highly valued in student's course evaluations (Appendix 4: Course evaluation results)[6]:

1. *New and unique content (philanthropy, third sector, teaching values) was promoted*. Students constantly showed interest for the presented topics. This was especially rewarding for me, because I felt that the content was important for the development of students as citizens.
2. In January 1996. *"Philanthropic Collection"* was formally established at the School of Education library, which enabled access to recent publications. It have to be mentioned that students' access to recent literature for this course is outstanding when compared to other

courses. Regarding poorly equipped libraries all over Croatia, "Philanthropic Collection" is unique in our country, collecting the newest publication from the field of philanthropy and the third sector (Appendix 3: "Philanthropic Collection").

3. *Student-oriented methods were regularly used* (group discussions, panels and independent study was emphasized). I delivered mini-lectures only when I was to present various ideas from foreign literature, which should take students too much time and efforts.
4. *Final exam was avoided*, because students were expected to do a lot of work during the course;
5. *Course evaluation was done continuously*. Generally, student's evaluation showed that this was one of the best courses they enrolled, particularly concerning the quality of content, teaching methods and applicability to their future practice. They stated that the innovations I have been describing in this paper should be maintained and further developed.
6. One of the students took her *graduate thesis from the course "Philanthropy and Education"*.

Plans and perspectives for teaching philanthropy and promoting initiatives in philanthropy and third sector in Croatia: what is to be achieved?

Although having success among the students, what gave me a lot of (personal) satisfaction and motivation for the future work, I was faced with a lot of difficulties and recognized a lot of problems doing this pioneer work. However, I believe that for at least some of them possible approaches to solutions could be found.

1. General

a) It is inevitable fact that countries in transition, including Croatia, will take many years for developing their forms of what we now call civil society. Although we did a lot of course work and opened many problems, I felt that for my students this was only a small drop in a sea of unknown concepts and ideas. Therefore my opinion is that it will take us a lot of time, efforts and financial support to root the civic values and practices into (younger) generations. *Continuous effort, both from inside and outside (international community), which can't give visible and measurable results immediately, is needed*. It is especially important to influence on government's policy on third sector, in order to facilitate its development.

b) *Overall information on philanthropy and third sector in Croatia is rather poor* (Barath, 1993; Ledić 1996) *and contradictory* (comparing, b.e. the position of third sector in Croatia in Les, 1994, and Bežovan, 1995). It seems that at this point we are not publicly, fully and objectively aware of third sector characteristics in Croatia, nor, what is equally important, we expose these data regularly to the international community. In sources that deal with Central and Eastern Europe Croatia is often omitted, and we are rarely included in networking. Although a number of people in Croatia is for a longer period of time involved in the field and try to communicate their work to the international nonprofit audience (Coury and Despot Lucanin, 1996), I believe that much *more organized efforts should be made to present the third sector activities and problems in Croatia to the international community*. Besides, *establishing networking among third sector activities in Croatia* is essentially important. A lot of time, efforts

and funds could be saved by better communication within the third sector itself. Thinking on teaching philanthropy at the first place, I would consider possibilities to link the students on regular basis with the third sector units extremely valuable.

c) *Philanthropy and third sector are not recognized in my country as a respectable field of study*. Except only a few articles or papers (b.e., Bežovan 1995, Zrinščak 1996, Ledić 1995), it seems that scientific community did not accept philanthropy and third sector as a field of study yet[7]. Discourse on, b.e., Croatian terminology in philanthropy and third sector does not exist.

2. Publishing and advertising

a) As one of the biggest obstacles in spreading the philanthropic idea at every level, *lack of reading materials on Croatian language* occurred. Therefore it seems very important to support and *develop serious publishing activity in the field of philanthropy and third sector* in Croatian language.[8] Translations of the most important introductory texts should come at the first place.

b) It is necessary to *use every possible chance to promote third sector and philanthropic activities, in order to build climate which facilitates the development of the field*. In spite of flood of international NGOs which entered Croatia especially during the refugee crisis, I consider that the real importance of building strong third sector in our country is still not widely recognised. Due to circumstances, the stress was/is on relief, not on civil society development. I believe that, as only one of the possible initiatives, non-profit sector should *work on development plans and projects* and present those initiatives to the interested investors and associations.

3. Teaching

a) To promote teaching philanthropy is to include *colleagues form various disciplines to study and teach philanthropy and/or topics related to philanthropy*. It is, perhaps, to much to expect that courses like mine, which was specifically emphasizing the problems of philanthropy and third sector suddenly flourish, but I firmly believe there's a lot *of small spaces in university courses where these ideas could be presented*. The idea is that university teachers should recognize and stress those topics in their existing curricula of variuos disciplines. I believe that university professors interested in the field should try to work on establishing chair on philanthropy and third sector. This, I hope, could be done on inter-university level, and with the help of foreign academic centers.

b) Existing curriculum (Philanthropy and Education) should be given to more students and to be adapted to their specific needs. Unfortunately, the way university is organised in Croatia (consisting of schools which do not exchange their professors or courses) is obstacle for this idea to be realised. I believe that through *networking between organisations interested in philanthropy, non-profit sector and voluntary action in Central and Eastern Europe, curriculum on teaching this field could be spread to other interested institutions.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c) Based on what is already done in curriculum development, and according to the interests from the outside, *tailor-made short courses for different purposes could be prepared and offered* (b.e. Introduction to non-profits for economists, Prosocial behavior for psychologists, etc.).

It is extremely important to work with in-service teachers and prepare different workshops which should stress the problems of teaching philanthropic behavior within the use of existing textbooks and possibilities. Croatian school-teachers are obliged to use only the textbooks (usually only one), prescribed by the Ministry of Education. At this point it seems useless to develop special textbooks for promoting philanthropy and prosocial skills only, because they would not find proper place in the curriculum. What seems more important and useful is to find possibilities how to do this *within* given texts, and through *in-service teacher's education*. This seems to be crucial, because if we work only with teachers to be, and curriculum-to-be, we postpone the process of teaching philanthropic behavior for a longer period of time.

4. Research

Closely linked with teaching and publishing activity, I believe that (small range) *research in the field is necessary to promote teaching and every other serious activity in the field*. By example, existing textbooks should be carefully explored, range of existing prosocial and giving behavior among school-children should be examined as well as attitudes an actual practice towards giving and helping in overall population. Actually, this should be starting point for every systematic activity with the children: knowing where we are will help us to know what to do.

5. Institution(s) to be founded

If we want to think about stable, systematic, long-lasting activity which aims to contribute to the development of civil society, then I find important for Croatia to have at least one *unit (center, department, organisation, association) which would gather all the mentioned main activities (teaching, research and publishing) and include some other activities and more people.*

Although we can trace the development of such activities in Croatia [9] I consider that our "Philanthropic Collection" could be seen as one of the logical points from which organization (association, unit, center) could start to develop. Such an organization should *stress its primarily educational purpose*, and its location within the school of education is excellent for its possible influence on people dealing with education.[10] Its structure and purpose could be:

1. to promote teaching on philanthropy;
2. to promote research on philanthropy;
3. to promote publishing on philanthropy (in Croatian language, and to disseminate information about Croatian philanthropy);
4. to further develop the "Philanthropic Collection" (serve as information source for students, schools and citizens, publishing newsletters, bibliographies, etc.);

5. to have a kind of "hot-line" for public (students answer the calls, give information about the third sector activities, about how-to: find grants, organise association, get in touch with people with same problems, set-up self help group, etc.);
6. build a data base of institutions and people in philanthropy and third sector in Croatia;
7. establish several programs (b.e. MAGIC ME in Croatia - program that links children and elderly; pre-retirement programs which will stress the involvement in community activities after retirement, etc.)
9. organise and support public activities (lectures, public speaking, volunteer work);
10. generally, to serve as place where students and teachers can meet and express their interests in this filed.

Conclusion

I hope that "Philanthropy and Education" will have its future, as course and as an idea. I succeeded to include this course on graduate level as well (as elective course), and in this academic year I teach philanthropy at undergraduate and graduate level. I hope that by March 1997, I will prepare the first draft of manual for teaching philanthropy, a publication for my students which will step-by-step lead them through curriculum. I do hope that my experience and work done could serve as one of the directions for promoting teaching philanthropy in this region.

References:

Barath, A. (1993). The nonprofit and voluntary sector in Croatia: Critical reflections on history, present and future. In E.Kuti (Ed.), *A nonprofit szektor Europaban* (A nonprofit sector in Europe, No. 4). Budapest, Hungary: Nonprofit Kutatasok

Bežovan, G. (1995). Neprofitni sektor i socijalna politika (Non-profit organizations and the welfare mix). *Revija za socijalnu politiku* (Journal of social policy), (2)3:195-214.

Coury, J.M. and Despot Lucanin, J. (1996). Mending the social safety net after state socialism: "Dobrobit" - one nongovernmental organization in Zagreb, Croatia. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3):283-301.

Ledić, J. (1995). Treći sektor: okvir za razvoj civilnog društva i djelovanja u području okoliša (The third sector: a framework for the development of civil society and environmental activities). Paper presented at the colloquium *"Hrvatsko društvo pred ekološkim izazovima"* ("Croatian Society in Front of Environmental Challenges"), Zagreb, March 26, 1996.

Ledić, J. (1996). *Teaching philanthropy in Croatia: Problems and projects*. ERIC document, ED 392 754

Merriam, Sh.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Zrinščak, S. (1995). Religija, Crkva i treći sektor u Srednjoj i Istočnoj Europi (Religion, Church and the third secto in Central and Eastern Europe). *Revija za socijalnu politiku* (Journal of social policy), (2)4:305-314.

List of appendixes:

Appendix 1: Philanthropy and Education (extended) course syllabi
Appendix 2: List of (basic) translated texts (articles and chapters of the books) used in the course
Appendix 3: "Philanthropic Collection"
Appendix 4: Course evaluation results

Notes:

[1] I was involved in this program while staying at Indiana University Bloomington as Fulbright scholar from March 1994 till December 1994. In this period I made contacts with Robert Payton, professor of philanthropy and Dr. Miroslav Ruzica, director of "Eastern European Initiative", both from Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Being newcomer in the field, I was hosted by Indiana University Center on Philanthropy for three months (December 1994-February 1995), actually entering the field for the first time and working on literature for my future work to be done after I return to my home country.

[2] It seems that educational sciences is the best possible translation for that program. Students who graduate this program are supposed to work primarily in the schools (elementary and high schools). They are expected to work on a lot of different activities, be., to work on advising, to develop teachers' in-service education, to serve as mentors for beginning teachers, to establish contacts with parents, take care of students with special needs, organize school's special events, etc. Till recently, almost every (elementary) school had a kind of "team for professional assistance", which, according to the number of students in the school, consisted of school psychologist, social worker, "pedagogue" (graduated educational sciences), and person specialized for special needs students. Unfortunately, Croatian Ministry of education is not willing to financially support the team, and professional service in our schools is recently falling apart, causing the deterioration of school's overall activities. Mostly, schools are able to keep only one person from the team, which seriously influences the level of quality education. Being informed about these happenings, students are gravely discouraged. Most of them are fully aware that, if the trend continues, they will not be able to find the work. On the other hand, a number of our graduate students work on variety of different jobs: as journalists, in local government, etc.

[3] Class meeting of three hours means 3 x 45 minutes. Since our universities still keep very old fashioned tradition of division between "lectures" and "seminars" within the same course, we were scheduled to have 2 hours of lectures and 1 hour of seminar at every class meeting. It is expected that professor, who is responsible for the course, entitled to "sign" the course and holds exams, is to deliver only lectures, and teaching assistant is responsible for seminars. Usually, the lectures are given in traditional manner, that is, professor is delivering information without much communication with the students. In seminars, students usually present their (mostly individually written) papers. The level of communication depends on student "willingness" to participate in discussions. Unfortunately, the communication between professor and teaching assistant is often too weak, and

students are not motivated to put very much efforts in their papers and presentations. Their work in seminar usually does not influence grade obtained at final exam.

[4] During the evaluation which took place at the last class, I was told that they did not make "a good bargain" with me regarding the avoidance of final exam. They said they spent much more time doing assignments and readings during the academic year, then they would probably do if they only had final exam and one term paper (as usual). This proofs again how teaching and learning at Croatian universities are in dire need for substantial changes. The ratio between contact hours at the class meetings and hours they were required to work out of classes was, I would estimate, 1:1. But this was too much work for them, when they compared it with assignments and hours spent for preparing assignments and final exam for other courses they have enrolled.

[5] Due to poor equipment of libraries and other facilities, students often have to purchase books needed for their studying. During the course I was able to give them with no charge, copies of the translated texts. I have to state that I did not ask for the copyright for the texts I was translating. I did not charge the students even for the copies, and translations were copied and used exclusively for teaching purposes of 22 students.

[6] Course evaluation is not regularly done at Croatian universities. One can not find questionnaire that is regularly used for course evaluation, nor can find any point of relation to colleagues' work. This made me to do my own thorough evaluations twice, at the end of semester and at the end of the academic year. Shorter evaluations were done constantly using CAT (Class Assessment Techniques). Two broader (different) course evaluations showed the success of the course (Appendix 4: Course evaluation results).

[7] I have already faced the problem of accepting this work form the colleague's side; the field is quite new and still unrecognized, not fitting into the traditionally accepted disciplines and subdivisions among them. B.e., in my career as a professor in education, my work in philanthropy does not "fit" very well, and my colleagues from the field will probably not be willing to include my (scientific) work in philanthropy in the future re-election procedures. This fact will, probably, discourage young people from various disciplines to study and publish about philanthropy.

[8]. I started this work for the purpose of my course. It seems it would be very important that people interested in the field in Croatia gather as editors of the publication(s) which would collect essential texts in philanthropy and third sector.

[9] CERANEO (Centre for Development of Non-Profit Organisations) founded in Zagreb, Croatia in 1995, seems to have such a mission. It is a non-profit, non political organisation formed by a group of individuals with the intention of meeting the needs of all kinds of non-profit organisations in Croatia (Associations, Foundations and Public Benefit Companies). It works to provide management development, encourage philanthropy and provide information to donors, assisting the development of the legal framework and provide a range of information services to NGOS. The beneficiaries of the Centre are defined in the statute as: those NGOs serving charitable, humanitarian and cultural purposes, namely providing assistance to victims of war, protecting the environment, defending human rights and resolving conflict and all other non-profit organisations with charitable objects.The Centre's goals are clearly stated in the Statute and fall under these headings: *Philanthropic*: To encourage philanthropy and patronage, facilitate and develop co-operation between donors and NGO projects; assists government, develop regulations and laws which will stimulate donations; *Technical*: Providing help with the process of establishing of NGOS; providing help and advice to NGOs in the promotion and development of their programmes and activities; *Information*: To gather information relevant to the sector (legal regulations, funding sources, information about organisations) and disseminates it to NGOs and also to government and any interested party), encourages scientific research on the NGO sector;
Development: To develop public awareness of the activities and achievements of NGOs and of the Centre; to undertake such other tasks as may contribute to the advance of the sector. The Centre is a member of the Orpheus network similar support centres. (from CERANEO's information flyer)

Although stressed wide range of activities, it seems that CERANEO missed to emphasize the importance of education.

[10] The first generation of students who enrolled "Philanthropy and Education" developed a project proposal based on this idea, and submitted the proposal for possible founding to the Open Society Institute - Croatia. Regretfully, the project was not accepted with the explanation that is "not found relevant for the development of civil society". This fact also brought me to a conclusion that the importance of education for the development of civil society is not sufficiently recognized.

Appendix 1

PHILANTHROPY AND EDUCATION
(extended) course syllabi[1]

THE AIMS OF THE COURSE

The aims of the course are:

- to introduce and clarify the philanthropic idea within the field of education;
- to explain philanthropic tradition and the development of third sector;
- to present research results in the field, as well as methodological problems;
- to introduce domestic traditions and initiatives in the field, with the special emphasis on education;
- to explore how to find solutions for the educational problems in the frame of philanthropic activities;
- to influence on positive attitudes towards community and the development of prosocial behavior among students.

THE CONTENT OF THE COURSE

I. Goals

1. Who we are, what are we to learn, which are our rules ("mission statement")
2. The field and the goals of the course

II. Philanthropy

1. Main issues and definitions
2. Philanthropic tradition
3. Examples of philanthropic tradition (actions for the public good)

III. Introducing third sector

1. The third sector - the problems of definitions and comparative perspective
2. Present condition and problems of the third sector development in Croatia
3. The development of civil society
4. Associations
5. Case study: voluntary organisations serving the community
6. Foundations
7. How to apply for a grant

[1] The way course syllabi are presented in the United States and Croatia differ. What is presented in this Appendix is the translation of the course syllabi prepared according to the School of Education /Department of Education requirements.

IV. Philanthropy and education

1. Philanthropy and education
2. Approaches to moral education (E.Durkheim, L.Kohlberg, values clarification, anti-moral education, J.Dewey)
3. School, community and the development of prosocial behaviour
4. How to stimulate prosocial behaviour in children
5. Case study: children and philanthropic action
6. How to establish links between school, parents and students

COURSE REQUIRENMENTS

1. Students are required to regularly attend classes and do assignments which, besides readings, consist from:

a) 1-2 individually prepared written thesis regarding assigned readings (one page; students should address the problem they are interested in; summary of what was read should be avoided; students should formulate their own answer to the problem, compare the assignment to the previous readings or articulate problem which arise within reading; generally, students should explain their position);
b) to prepare 1-2 written answers to the series of questions presented at the class. Questions will be addressing general questions and problems presented in the class, and answers/analysis should be written in not more than 5 pages. It is expected to distribute the copies to the group for reviewing.
c) to prepare review of one text (article or book chapter).
d) to prepare series of reaction papers (about 2 pages, once in a month). In this paper one sentence should expose the argument of every reading assignment; how the author presented the argument and questions that arise from the reading. Short paper may be the answer to the specific assignment as well.
e) to prepare review of term paper proposal (made by group or individual student).

2. Field work

Students are required to spend up to 15 hours in a voluntary/non-profit/nongovernmental organisation chosen by themselves. During his visit students gather information about the organisation and write a journal to analyse their experience.

3. Final paper (up to 15 pages)

This paper is usually result of group work. Students prepare a proposal (up to 5 pages), reviewed by other students. It is expected that this paper contribute to the development of philanthropic idea in the practice of education. In the paper students should: 1. gather information and consider goals, activities, organisational structure, funding, objectives and problems; 2. make contributions according to the goals of organisation chosen. It is expected to make a concrete result. Students themselves find the organisation to apply the project; choosing the organisation is part of the assignment.

Exceptionally, this paper could also have altered aim.

TEACHING PROCEDURES AND STUDENT ASSESSMENT

In this course the traditional separation on seminar and lecture classes is intended to be avoided. The content will be presented through mini-lectures, discussions and student's presentations, as well as student's independent study. It is considered that regular work on class assignments is essential for successful studying. Final exam will be organised only exceptionally, if the student's class work is considered to be insufficient. The final grade consists of following: class assignments and activities (50%), term paper presentation (30%), non-profit organisation analysis (20%). Students are to receive feedback about their work regularly. For a student to pass, it is necessary that not one of the mentioned elements is assessed insufficient.

THE COURSE AND ITS CORRELATION TO THE OTHER COURSES

The course "Philanthropy and education" is interdisciplinary connected with various different disciplines (philosophy, sociology, psychology, economy). In the field of education, the field of moral education is emphasised.

Appendix 2

LIST OF (BASIC) TRANSLATED TEXTS (ARTICLES AND CHAPTERS OF THE BOOKS) USED IN THE COURSE

Berkowitz, B. (1987). *Local heroes*. Lexington: Lexington Books

Chazan, B. (1985). *Contemporary Approaches to Moral Education. Analyzing Alternative Theories*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Curti, M. (1973). *Philanthropy*. In: P.P. Weiner (Ed.) The Dictionary of the History of Ideas. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Greenberg P. (1992). Ideas That Work With Young Children. How To Institute Some Simple Democratic Practices Pertaining to Respect, Rights, Roots, and Responsibilities in Any Classroom (Without Loosing Your Leadership Position). *Young Children*, 47(5):10-17.

Kostelnik, M.J., Stein, L.C., Phipps Wiren, A., Soderman, A.K. (1993*). Guiding Children's Social Development*, 2nd ed. Albany, N.Y.: Delmar Publishers. (Chapter 14: Promoting prosocial behavior, pp. 406-429.)

Salamon, L.M., Anheier, H.K. (1992) In Search of the Nonprofit Sector. I: The Question of Definitions. *Voluntas*, 3(2):125-151

Appendix 3

"PHILANTHROPIC COLLECTION"

"Philanthropic Collection", situated at the University of Rijeka School of Education library, was formally opened on January 25, 1996. The opening of the Collection, which is essentially important for the development of the field and teaching the course, was made possible by the Indiana University Center of Philanthropy funding. The Collection primarily collects the literature on philanthropy, third sector and voluntary activities, but includes also the topics connected with American studies, education, philosophy, sociology, religion, etc.

It is planned that during this academic year students prepare Web pages presenting the collection on the INTERNET.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE "PHILANTHROPIC COLLECTION" (status: October 1996):

1. Ajduković, M., i Pećnik, N. (1994). *Nenasilno rješavanje sukoba*. 2. izd. Zagreb: Alinea.
2. Anheiner, H.K., i Seibel, W. (Ed.) (1990). *The third sector: Comaprative studies of nonprofit organizations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
3. Bagin, D. i dr., (1994). *School and Community Relations*. 5 izd. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
4. Balić, J., Hudina, B., Koller Trbović, N., i Žižak, A. (1994). *Integralna metoda u radu s predškolskom djecom i njihovim roditeljima*. Zagreb: Alinea.
5. Belcher J.C., Jacobsen J.M. (1992). *From Idea to Funded Project: Grant Proposals That Work*. 4. izd. Pxoenix: Oryx Press.
6. Bellah, R.N. et al. (1991). *The Good Society*. New York: Vintage Books.
7. Bellah, R.N. et al. (1986). *Habits of the heart. Individualism and commitment in American life*. New York: Harper and Row.
8. Berkowitz, B. (1987). *Local heroes*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
9. Brajša, P. (1995). *Sedam tajni uspješne škole*. Zagreb: Školske novine.
10. Bratanić, M. (1993). *Mikropedagogija. Interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
11. Bremner, R.H. (1988). *American philanthropy*. 2. izd. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
12. Bremner, R.H. (1993). *Giving: Charity and philanthropy in history*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
13. Brice Heath, S., McLaughlin, M.W. (ur.) (1993). *Identity and inner-city youth: beyond ethnicity and gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.
14. Brown, P. (1995). *Florence Nightingale*. Zagreb: Illyricum.

15. Brown, P. (1993). *Henry Dunant*. Zagreb: Illyricum.

16. Bryk, A.S., Lee, V.E., Holland, P.B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

17. Bunčić, K., Ivković, Đ., Janković, J. i Penava, A. (1994). *Igrom do sebe. 102 igre za rad u grupi*. Zagreb: Alinea.

18. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. (1995). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

19. Chelsom Gossen, D. (1994). *Restitucija. Preobrazba školske discipline*. Zagreb: Alinea.

20. Colby, A. i Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care*. New York: Free Press.

21. Curti, M. (1988). *American Philanthropy abroad*. (reprint). New Brunswick/Oxford: Transaction books.

22. Damon, W. (1988). *The moral child. Nurturing children's natural moral growth*. New York: The Free Press.

23. D'Amours, M. (Ed.). (1986). *International Directory of Academic Institutions in Leisure, Recreation and Related Fields*. Quebec: Presses de l'Universite du Quebec.

24. Dass, R. i Gorman, P. (1985). *How can I help?: Stories and reflections on service*. New York: Alfred A.Knopf.

25. Dobkin Hall, P. (1992). *Inventing the nonprofit sector and other essays on philanthropy, voluntarism, and nonprofit organizations*. Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

26. Eisenberg, N. (Ed.). (1982). *The development of prosocial behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

27. Eisenberg, N., Reykowski, J., Staub, E. (Ed.). (1989). *Social and moral values. Individual and societal perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

28. Erickson, J.B. (1994). *Directory of American Youth Organizations (1994-1995)*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit.

29. Floyd, E. (1992). *Marketing with newsletters: How to boost sales, add members, raise donations & further your cause*. St.Louis, MO: Newsletter resources.

30. The Foundation Center. (1995). *The Foundation Grants Index (1996)*. New York: The Foundation Center.

31. The Foundation Center. (1995). *Grants for International and Foreign Programs (1995-1996)*. New York: Foundation Center.

32. Frankel Paul, E., Miller, F.D.Jr., i Paul, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Altruism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

33. Frankfurt, H. (1988). *The importance of what we care about*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

34. Gies, D.L., Ott, J.S., Shafritz, J.M. (1989). *The Nonprofit Organization. Essential Readings*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

35. Giesecke, H. (1993). *Uvod u pedagogiju*. Zagreb: Educa.

36. Gjergji, L. (1990). *Majka Tereza. Lik i djelo*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost.

37. Good, P.E. (1993). *Kako pomoći klincima da si sami pomognu*. Zagreb: Alinea.

38. Good, P.E. (1991). *U potrazi za srećom. Kad saznate što želite dobit ćete što trebate*. Zagreb: Alinea.

39. Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., i Sirotnik, K.A. (Ed.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

40. Gray, Ch. (1993). *Majka Tereza*. Zagreb: Illyricum.

41. Gussin Paley, V. (1992). *You can't say you can't play*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

42. Hall, V.H. (1995). *Foundation Grants to Individuals*. New York: The Foundation Center.

43. Harvey, B. (1992). *Networking in Europe: a guide to European voluntary organisations*. London: NCVO Publications: Community Development Foundation.

44. Honig, A.S., i Wittmer, D.S. (1992). *Prosocial Development in Children: Caring, Helping and Cooperating*. New York: Garland Publishing.

45. Iereley, M. (1984). *With Charity for All. Welfare and Society, Ancient Times to the Present*. New York: Praeger.

46. Janković, J. (1994). *Sukob ili suradnja*. Zagreb: Alinea.

47. Joseph J.A.. (1989). *The charitable impulse. Wealth and social conscience in communities and cultures outside the United States*. New York: The Foundation Center.

48. Kalin, B. (1994). *Povijest filozofije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

49. Karnes, F.A., Bean, S.M. (1993). *Girls and Young Woman Leading the Way*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit.

50. Kendall, J. C. et al. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Vol 1. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Internship and Experiental Education.

51. Kendall, J. C. et al. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Vol 2. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Internship and Experiental Education.

52. Kidder, R.M. (1994). *Shared values for a troubled world. Conversation with men and women of conscience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

53. Kohn, A. (1990). *The brighter side of human nature: Altruism and empathy in everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

54. Kostelnik, M. J. et al. (1993). *Guiding Children's Social Development*, 2 izd. Albany, NY: Delmar Publisher Inc.

55. Kramer, R.M. et al. (1993). *Privatization in four European countries. Comparative studies in government-Third sector relationship*. Armonk: M.E.Sharpe.

56. Kyriacou, Ch. (1995). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća. Metodički priručnik za uspješno poučavanje i učenje*. Zagreb: Educa.

57. Legrand, L. (1995). *Moralna izobrazba danas. Ima li to smisla?* Zagreb: Educa.

58. Levin, D.E., Carlson-Paige, N. (1990). *Who's calling the shots?* Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

59. Lewis, B.A.. (1992). *Kids with Courage*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit.

60. Lickona, Th. (1992). *Educating for character*. New York: Bantam Books.

61. MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. 2. izd. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

62. Magat, R. (Ed.) (1989). *Philanthropic giving. Studies in varieties and goals*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

63. Magat, R. (1990). *Prospective Views of Research on Philanthropy and the Voluntary Sector*. New York: Foundation Center.

64. Maleš, D. i Stričević, I. (1991). *Druženje djece i odraslih*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

65. Mansbridge, J.J. (1990). *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

66. McAllister Swap, S. (1993). *Developing home-school partnership. From concepts to practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

67. McCarthy, K. (1984). *Philanthropy and Culture: The International Foundation Perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

68. McKenty, E. J. i Johnson, J.E. (1995). *The Literature of the nonprofit sector. A bibliography with abstracts*. Volume 7. New York: The Foundation Center.

69. McManners, J. (Ed.). (1992). *The Oxford illustrated history of Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

70. Miller, A. (1995). *Drama djetinjstva. U početku bijaše odgoj: u potrazi za samim sobom*. Zagreb: Educa.

71. Natale, S. M., Wilson, J.B. (1991). *Central Issues in Moral and Ethical Education*. Lanham: University Press of America.

72. O'Connel, B. (1987). *Philanthropy in action*. New York: The Foundation Center.

73. Payton, R. (1988). *Philanthropy. Voluntary Action for the Public Good*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

74. Prutzman P. et al. (1988). *The Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet: A Handbook of Creative Approaches to Living and Problem Solving for Children*. Avery:New Society Publishers.

75. Puka, B. (Ed.). (1994). *Reaching out. Caring, altruism and prosocial behavior*. Volume 7. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

76. Rigsby, L.C., Reynolds, M.C. i Wang, M.C. (Ed.). (1995). *School-community connections: exploring issues for research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

77. Riley, S (1984). *How to generate values in young children*. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC (National Association for Education of Young Children).

78. Salamon, L. M. (1992). *America's nonprofit sector. A primer*. New York: Foundation Center.

79. Schoredt, V. i Brown, P. (1993). *Marthin Luther King*. Zagreb: Illyricum.

80. Sears, J. (1990). *Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

81. Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994). *Building Community in Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

82. Sharan, Sh. (Ed.). (1990). *Cooperative learning. Theory and research*. Westport, CT, London: Praeger.

83. Shogan, D. (1988). *Care and Moral Motivation*. Ontario: OISE Press.

84. Simon, S. B., Howe, L.W., i Kirschenbaum, H. (1978). *Values Clarification. A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*. Hadley, MA: Values Associates.

85. Slavin, R. et al., (Ed.) (1985). *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn*. New York: Plenum.

86. Sommers, Ch., Sommers, F. (1993). *Vice and virtue in everyday life*. 3. izd. New York: Harcourt Brace.

87. Soros, G. (1993). *Podrška demokraciji*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.

88. Straughan, R. (1988). *Can we teach children to be good. Basic issues in moral, personal and social education.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

89. Thompson, K. W. (Ed.). (1987). *Private means, public ends.* Lanham: UNiversity Press of America.

90. Uzelac, M. et al., (1994). *Budimo prijatelji. Priručnik odgoja za nenasilje i suradnju. Pedagoške radionice za djecu od 6 do 14 godina.* Zagreb: Slon.

91. Voltaire. (1990). *Rasprava o toleranciji.* Zagreb: Školske novine.

92. Wood, D.A. (1995). *Kako djeca misle i uče. Društveni konteksti spoznajnog razvitka.* Zagreb: Educa.

93. Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion. Caring for others and helping ourselves.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

94. Wuthnow, R. (Ed.). (1991). *Between states and markets. The voluntary sector in comparative perspective.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

95. Wuthnow, R., Hodkinson, V. A. & ass., (1990). *Faith and philanthropy in America. Exploring the role of religion an America's voluntary sector.* San Francisco/Oxford: Jossey Bass Publisher.

JOURNALS

The Chronicle on Philanthropy
Erazmus
Harvard Educational Review
Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
Teachers College Record
Transition
Voluntas

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Women and Philanthropy
ARNOWA news (vol 23, no. 1,2,3)
Independent Sector (1994)
Philanthropy (3 broja)
In side ISTR (2 broja)
Points of light (1994)
Rockefeller brothers fund (1993, 1994)
Carnegie Quarterly (2 broja)
Open Society News (1 broj
Kellogg
Lilly
Carnegie

Mellon Report 1993
Current Interests of The Ford Foundation, 1994 i 1995
The Ford Foundation Report 1994
H.F.Guggenheim Foundation 1993
Ford Foundation 1993 Annual Report
W.K.Kellog 1993 Annual Report
Rockefeller Brothers Fund Annual Report 1993
Carnegie Corporation of New York Annual Report 1994
Carnegie Newsline, October 13, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 4.

COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS

Besides CAT evaluation that took part regularly during the classes, two evaluations were done during the course: one at the end of the first semester, and one during the last class.

Evaluation at the end of the first semester (January 1996):

For the first evaluation, a simple form was developed. Students had to mark the description of the statements they agreed with. Two questions were opened, letting the students to form their own statements.

Evaluation form and results:

How often do the following statements describe the course "Philanthropy and Education":
(scale of five; allways=5; never= 1)

1. teacher gives clear explanations (4,66)[2]
2. class meetings are interesting (4,38)
3. classes are well organized (4,44)
4. student's activity is supported (4,33)
5. students know what they are expected to do (4,66)
6. out-of-class work is useful (4,33)

Comparing to the other courses you have enrolled, how would you describe work in this course according to:
(scale of five; very much=5, never=1)

7. acquiring concepts and facts (4,38)
8. developing esteem towards the field (4,38)
9. understanding the texts (3,61)
10. developing the skills of oral and written expression (4,38)
11. understanding problem-solving in the field (4,22)
12. applying the knowledge in practice and other courses (3,83)
13. general intellectual development and challenge (4,50)

14. In this course I especially liked...
(list of answers)

- interesting topics
- the development of ethics
- discussion, freedom to express my opinion

[2] The number is mean.

- interesting classes
- motivation for activity
- new methods
- different from others
- interesting
- continuous communication
- useful, easy to learn
- I liked everything
- the development of philanthropic behavior
- topics related to social conscience
- stressing the importance of morality
- new topics
- teacher helped to clear the problems
- methods (because lectures were avoided)
- student's participation
- enough time for assignments
- informal methods
- development of our own attitudes and ideas
- considering student's suggestions
- continuos work
- content (in spite of being entirely new)
- interesting and different lectures
- attempt to change the traditional practice
- entirely different
- dynamic
- knowledge acquired by active learning
- independent study
- the content of the course
- things we didn't pay attention to
- motivation for independent study during the course

15. In this course I especially disliked...
(list of answers)

- sometimes difficult topics which needed to much literature to study
- to big expectations from the teacher
- atmosphere in the class
- atmosphere between the students
- the relationship between the teacher and some of the students
- seminar (too much time and efforts; it should be substituted with smaller projects)
- too weak communication in the group
- the teacher put her ideas in front of ours
- evaluation (although inevitable)
- English language literature

Evaluation at the end of the course (June 1996)

The evaluation was performed in a form of a "talking wall". Students were required to freely (individually) answer two questions, writing their answers on separate cards. After all the cards were sticked under "+" and "-" sign, we interpreted the answers and made conclusions. Here I present the summary of the answers.

What was well done in this course (what should be kept)
("+")

- attempt to innovate teaching methods
- content, we learned a lot of new things needed for us as persons
- the course was of high quality, we discussed a lot and worked a lot
- the texts we have received were excellent, we're going to use them in our own practice
- the communication was very good, the best regarding all other courses
- the motivation for studying was good, probably because of continuous assessment
- the content of the course was applicable in the practice, especially regarding moral education
- the course materials were very good
- teaching methods were not traditional, comparing to other courses
- the stress on student's activity was very good, especially the assessment of the activity (in other courses the students are asked to be active, but all ends at the final exam, and, finally, it does not matter whether you have been active or not, you are stupid if you were)
- the avoidance of final exam was very motivating, and this should be spread to other courses as well

What was bad in this course (what should be improved or avoided)
("-")

- the texts were difficult to understand
- we should improve the communication
- the assessment feedback should be improved
- the motivation for field work in philanthropy should be better
- more voluntary work
- some topics should have been avoided
- too much attention on moral reasoning
- I vote for final exam
- student assessment should be changed
- assessment should be more precised, b e , if you want the best grade, you have to do this, if you want to pass only, you have to do that
- we were overloaded with assignments